

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-8 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if claim 5 is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The § 103 rejection of claims 1-4 and 9-12 as detailed in the Office Action dated September 22, 2004 have been maintained. Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Noriaki, et al. (JP 10-271490) (“Noriaki”), in view of Noso (JP 3-99952) (“Noso”). Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 and the claims directly and indirectly dependent therefrom are patentably distinct from the cited references, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify an aspect of the invention related to the pixel mapping process. More specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “the display control means transforms the input image...by obtaining coordinates of input pixels corresponding to each

output pixel and the display control mean displays as each output pixel, the input pixels having the obtained coordinates.”

Applicant submits that neither Noriaki, nor Noso, taken alone or in combination teach, disclose or suggest the invention, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Although the Examiner alleges that Noso discloses the claimed invention, Applicants disagree and request that if the Examiner maintains the rejection on this basis, he provide support for the assertion that Noso discloses “the concept of a display control means transforming the input image on the basis of the positional relationship between respective pixels of the output image to be displayed...and respective pixels of the input image....” (See, Advisory Action, “Continuation of 11”, ¶4) (emphasis added).

Moreover, Applicants have amended independent to further clarify the claimed pixel transforming process. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, obtaining coordinates of input pixels that correspond to each output pixel and ...[displaying] as each output pixel, the input pixels having the obtained coordinates. Applicants herein incorporate the discussion of the technical differences between Noso and the claimed invention as discussed in the Response dated December 22, 2004. Based on the differences discussed therein and the amendments to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Noso does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1, as well as the claims directly or indirectly dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

Serial No. 09/856,921

Docket No. 5000-4888

Amendment dated February 22, 2005

Reply to Advisory Action of February 11, 2005

CONCLUSION

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: February 22, 2005

By: 

Peter N. Fill

Registration No. 38,876

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

3 World Financial Center

New York, NY 10281

(212) 415-8700 (telephone)

(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)